

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, LTD., AND  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,  
Petitioners

v.

IMAGE PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

CASE IPR2017-00336  
Patent No. 6,959,293

---

**PATENT OWNER IMAGE PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Overview of the '293 Patent.....	3
A.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	8
B.	Claim Construction .....	9
1.	“the histogram calculation units being configured to form a histogram representative of the parameter” (Claim 1).....	10
2.	“a classification unit . . . configured to determine the data in the histogram that satisfy a selected criterion” (Claim 18) .....	14
3.	“wherein classification is performed automatically by processing statistical information associated with the calculated histogram” (Claim 18) .....	17
III.	Grounds 2 and 3 Are Fatally Flawed Because the Petition Does Not Establish that Rogers Is Prior Art.....	21
IV.	Legal Standards .....	25
V.	No Review Should Be Instituted for Claims 1, 18, 19, 22, and 29 .....	29
A.	The Asserted References Do Not Teach or Suggest All Elements of Claims 1, 18, 19, or 29 of the '293 Patent .....	29
1.	None of the asserted references teaches or suggests “the histogram calculation units being configured to form a histogram representative of the parameter” (Claim 1) .....	29
2.	None of the asserted references teaches or suggests “wherein classification is performed automatically by processing statistical information associated with the calculated histogram” (Claim 18) .....	36
3.	Tomitaka does not teach or suggest “wherein . . . automatic classification involves updating the selection criteria in the memory table based on the processed statistical information” (Claim 19) .....	46

4.	None of the asserted references teaches or suggests “automatically updating, for each instant of time, the classification criteria stored in the classification memory based on statistical information associated with the histogram” (Claim 29) .....	48
B.	The Petition Fails to Identify a Reason and Motivation that Would Have Prompted a POSA to Combine the Asserted Prior Art.....	48
1.	The Petition fails to identify a reason and motivation why a POSA would have combined Pirim and Tomitaka .....	49
2.	The Petition fails to identify a reason and motivation why a POSA would have combined Rogers and Gilbert.....	55
3.	The Petition fails to identify a reason and motivation why a POSA would have combined Tomitaka and Rogers.....	57
C.	Petitioner’s Asserted Combination of References is Driven by Improper Hindsight .....	61
VI.	Conclusion .....	64

## Table of authorities

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>2Wire, Inc. v. TQ Delta LLC</i> , IPR2015-00239, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. May 29, 2015) .....	24
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	10
<i>Apple Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00442, Paper 9 (July 13, 2015) .....	26, 27
<i>Apple Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00369, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2015).....	22
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc., v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014).....	25
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Tech., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	9
<i>Dish Network L.L.C. v. Dragon Intellectual Property, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00499, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. July 17, 2015).....	21
<i>Front Row Techs., LLC v. MLB Advanced Media, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01932 Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 25, 2016).....	63
<i>Google Inc. v. ART+COM InnovationPool GmbH</i> , IPR2015-00788, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 2, 2015).....	24
<i>Google, Inc. v. Everymd.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014) .....	26
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	25, 26, 28
<i>Grain Processing v. American-Maize Prods</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	29
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	61

<i>International Business Machines Corporation v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , Case IPR2015-01323, Paper 38 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 27, 2016).....	24
<i>InTouch Tech., Inc. v. VGo Communs., Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	29
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01402 Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 21, 2015).....	62
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	26, 61
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	28, 29, 49, 60
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM-2012-00003, Paper 7 (Order) (P.T.A.B. Nov. 26, 2012).....	26, 27
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	21, 23
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	25, 27
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Bradium Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2015-01432, Paper 51 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 21, 2016) .....	28, 48
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Corel Software, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01083, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 1, 2016) .....	24
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	29, 61
<i>In re Omeprazole Patent Litigation</i> , 536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	28
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm. v. Mylan Labs</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	29, 61
<i>Proctor &amp; Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	27, 28

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.